

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 14, 2001 with claims 1 through 59. Claims 1 through 59 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 25-29, 40-44, and 55-59 are proposed to be cancelled, without prejudice, herein.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained the restriction requirement dated October 3, 2005 and rejected claims 1-16, 18, 30-37, and 45-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0157103A1). The Examiner has indicated that claims 19-24, 38-39, and 53-54 are allowed, and that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form
10 including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner maintained the restriction requirement dated October 3, 2005.

Claims 25-29, 40-44, and 55-59 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Independent Claims 1, 19, 30, 38, 45 and 53

15 Independent claims 1, 30, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (The Examiner has already indicated that claims 19, 38, and 53 are allowed.) Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Song teaches creating a plurality of levels (dividing into segments) for the media content (multimedia
20 presentation), and periodically transmitting (in periodic transmission process) each level (segments) (FIG. 1; page 2, paragraphs [0011-0013]).

Applicants note that the present disclosure teaches that “the levels segment the media and allow the media to be examined with *details that range from coarse to fine or examined with varying importance or both.*” (Page 3, lines 22-24; emphasis
25 added.) As the Examiner acknowledges, Song teaches to divide media content into segments. Regarding the segments, Song teaches that “these various segments of digital content together may make up a movie. These segments are preferably non-overlapping, and each of their sizes can be arbitrary, although quite often they are made equal length in time.” (Paragraph 0008.) Song does not, however, disclose or suggest levels (as
30 defined in the present invention) that are based on *details that range from coarse to fine, or based on varying importance, or both.* Independent claims 1, 30, and 45 require

creating a plurality of levels for the media content, and periodically transmitting each level.

Thus, Song et al. do not disclose or suggest creating a plurality of levels for the media content, and periodically transmitting each level, as required by independent claims 1, 30, and 45.

Dependent Claims 2-18, 20-24, 31-37, 39, 46-52 and 54

Dependent claims 2-16, 18, 31-37, and 46-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al.

Claims 2-18, 20-24, 31-37, 39, 46-52, and 54 are dependent on claims 1, 19, 30, 38, 45, and 53, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Song et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 19, 30, 38, 45, and 53 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 20-24, 39, and 54 are allowed, and that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1-24, 30-39, and 45-54, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 28, 2006

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560